

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/812,173	03/30/2004	Hung-Yi Lin	GEN0014-US	3347	
75	90 06/14/2		EXAMINER		
Michael D. Bednarek			RAHMJOO, MANUCHER		
Shaw Pittman LLP 1650 Tysons Boulevard			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
McLean, VA 22102			2676		
			DATE MAILED: 06/14/200	DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/812,173	LIN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mike Rahmjoo	2676				
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet v	with the correspondence ad	dress			
THE MAILING DATE OF Extensions of time may be avaing after SIX (6) MONTHS from the If the period for reply specified If NO period for reply is specified Failure to reply within the set or	TORY PERIOD FOR REPLY F THIS COMMUNICATION. lable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ded above, the maximum statutory period w extended period for reply will, by statute, e later than three months after the mailing See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of th vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become A	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely DNTHS from the mailing date of this co ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.			
Status							
1) Responsive to co	mmunication(s) filed on <u>3/30/</u>	<u>04</u> .		•			
2a) This action is FIN	AL. 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
,, , , ,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims				,			
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/a 7) ☐ Claim(s) is.	re rejected.	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is	s objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
<u> </u>	ng sheet(s) including the correct ation is objected to by the Ex	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	` '			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119 .						
a) All b) Some 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of the application	s made of a claim for foreign * c) None of: pies of the priority documents pies of the priority documents ne certified copies of the prior from the International Bureau etailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in ity documents have bee (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage			
Attachment(c)							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Pat	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date				
Information Disclosure State Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ment(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) -·	6) Notice of Other:	Informal Patent Application (PTO	<i>i</i> -102)			

Art Unit: 2676

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...with the said predefined..." in lines 4-5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "... to fancy the user interface..." in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "... for arranging the pattern codes..." inline 6.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "... on the user interface display window..." in line 7.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "... output the mixed signal..." in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 has similar rejections.

Claims 2- 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1 line 2 applicant recites "...image module unit for dealing with...". It is not made clear how an image module unit "deals". Is it processing or containing a pattern.

As per claims 2- 10 and 12 applicant recites each claim using "... a user interface...". It is not clear whether it is the same user interface display of independent claims.

As per claim 5 line 2 applicant recites "...using overlap to mix the patterns...". It is not clear what applicant is claiming. Is it the mixer unit which is performing the mixing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3- 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yukata et al (U Patent 5,917,504), hereinafter, Yutaka.

As per claims 1 and 11 Yutaka teaches an image module unit (see for example of figure 1) for dealing with predefined image patterns see for example figure 5a; a texture pattern unit (see for example fig. 2 for the AT block) for providing texture patterns to mix with the said predefined image pattern to fancy the user interface display see for example column 5 lines 30- 36 and column 8 lines 35- 35 wherein texture

Art Unit: 2676

patterns are mapped and transformed; a display code-buffer unit (see for example fig.2 block AD) for arranging the pattern codes which are displayed on the user interface display window see for example column 8 lines 35- 45 wherein texture patterns are arranged and displayed on image display monitor 65; and a mixer unit for mixing the patterns from said image module unit and texture pattern unit, and output the mixed signal see for example column 9 lines 46- 56 wherein the pictorial image is synthesized (mixed) with the background motion picture, the image data of the background motion picture is decompressed decoded and column 10 lines 51- 60 wherein transformation is executed by mixing.

As per claim 3 Yutaka teaches the predefined image pattern could be any combination of dot pixel see for example column 4 lines 5- 15 for the two modes with two different number of bits.

As per claim 4 Yutaka teaches the texture patterns can be defined by end-user (user control) see for example column 8 lines 1-9.

As per claim 5 Yutaka teaches the mixer unit using overlap to mix the patterns from said image module unit and texture pattern unit see for example column 8 lines 35-45 for the mapping and transformation of the texture patterns.

As per claim 7 Yutaka teaches the mixer unit using logic operation (imaging commands) to mix the patterns from said image module unit and texture pattern unit see for example figures 1- 10 and column 3 lines 59-65.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,173

Art Unit: 2676

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 8- 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka.

As per claims 2 and 12 Yutaka does not teach an outline shape index generator for providing the mixing index information to define the outline shape.

However, the background of Yutaka teaches an outline shape index generator for providing the mixing index information to define the outline shape see for example column 1 lines 20- 32 wherein the surface of an object is decomposed into plurality of polygons (polygons with shapes) and the thereafter reconstructed (mixed).

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of the background of the prior art made of the reference into Yutaka to define the outline of a shape and therefore keep the cost down and utilize the same conventional memory to reconstruct an image which can be stereographically seen see for example column 1 lines 20-60.

As per claim 8 Yutaka teaches the shape index generator further comprising subwindow define outline function see for example fig. 2 wherein texture patterns are performed through AT and figures 5 a- c for the mapping and transformation of patterns into new coordinates.

As per claim 9 Yutaka teaches the outline shape index generator further using alpha index for image pattern see for example figure 2 for block AC which is for the CLUT transformation.

As per claim 10 Yutaka teaches the outline shape index generator further using color key method for image pattern see for example column 5 lines 30- 45 for the CLUT.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

None of the prior art, either singularly or in combination, fairly teaches or suggests applicant's claimed invention wherein applicant recites" the mixer unit using alpha blending method, where output = (pattern from said image module limit) x alpha + (pattern from said texture pattern unit) x (I-alpha), the parameter alpha is a real number between 0 and 1.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,173

Art Unit: 2676

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure; US patent 5,920,303, 6,392,643, 6,097,402, 6,011,564, 4,808,988 and US PAP 2002/0008703.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-4357.

Mike Rahmjoo

June 8, 2005

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Marker C. Bella.

Page 7